

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 3 to 5 and 10 have been cancelled. New claims 12 to 20 have been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide that the base element has a first portion disposed on the bracket and a second protrusion portion protruding from the first portion in an axial direction and further that such second protrusion portion is disposed in the opening in the bracket in superimposed relationship with the ring magnet. There is no disclosure of the aforementioned arrangement in the cited Japanese reference JP '352. In JP '352 there is no base element having a protruding portion disposed in an opening. In JP '352 the base element 2 does not have any protrusion as shown in Fig. 1 of this reference. With applicant's claimed arrangement, the motor can be made thinner because the ring magnet can be disposed above the protrusion as shown in the right hand side of applicant's Fig. 1.

Applicant's claim 11 also sets forth the protrusion disposed in the opening. No such protrusion is disclosed in JP '352.

New claim 19 sets forth the protrusion and the recess and provides that the protrusion is disposed in the opening and that the ring magnet is disposed in the recess. There is no disclosure of this in JP '352.


Claims 2, 4, 7 and 9 were further rejected on Yamaguchi (USP 5,942,833). However, there is nothing disclosed in Yamaguchi which would adversely effect the reasons supporting patentability set forth hereinabove. Accordingly, combining JP '352 and Yamaguchi would not render applicant's claims unpatentable.

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and the allowance of claims 1, 2, 6 to 9 and 11 to 20 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By



Frank J. Jordan

Reg. No. 20,456

Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

FJJ/cj